

Implication of the Modified Gottfried Sum Rule

Susumu Koretune

Department of Physics, Fukui Medical School
Fukui, Matsuoka, 910-11 Japan

Implication of the modified Gottfried sum rule is discussed by focusing its theoretical bases, the range of validity, and physical interpretation.

(1) Modified Gottfried sum rule

Modified Gottfried sum rule takes the following form[1,2]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x} \{F_2^{ep}(x, Q^2) - F_2^{en}(x, Q^2)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{4f_K^2}{\pi} \int_{m_K m_N}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{\nu^2} \sqrt{\nu^2 - (m_K m_N)^2} \{ \sigma^{K^+n}(\nu) - \sigma^{K^+p}(\nu) \} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Both-hand sides of the sum rule are related to the same quantity

$$\frac{1}{3\pi} P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_3(\alpha, 0). \quad (2)$$

Hence the Gottfried sum rule measures the mean I_3 of something. This point is easily understood in the parton model. The left-hand side of the sum rule multiplied by 3/2 can be expressed in this model as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} u_v - \frac{1}{2} d_v \right\} + \int_0^1 dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \lambda_u - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_d \right\} - \int_0^1 dx \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\bar{u}} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\bar{d}} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dx \{ \lambda_u - \lambda_d + \lambda_{\bar{u}} - \lambda_{\bar{d}} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This means that the Gottfried sum rule measures the mean I_3 of the [(quark) - (anti-quark)] in the proton since [(quark) - (anti-quark)] is fixed to be 3. Therefore we can get information of the mean quantum number of the sea quarks in the proton.

Now, because of the O(4) symmetry in the inclusive lepton-hadron scatterings, O(4) partial wave expansion is possible in these process. Then these partial waves were shown to agree with the Nachtmann moments apart from trivial kinematic factors [3]. Thus the concept of the moment discussed in the operator product expansion has a general kinematic meaning. It can be used in a general context (for details see Ref.[3] and the papers cited therein). Then, all the sum rules discussed here correspond to the moment at $n = 1$. Since the moment at $n = 1$ for the flavor non-singlet had been considered to be well predicted by the perturbative QCD, the Q^2 dependence of the Gottfried sum rule was checked in Ref.[4], and, in the next-to-leading order, it was given roughly as $0.01[\alpha_s(Q^2) - \alpha_s(Q_0^2)]$. By estimating this value, the Gottfried sum rule was found to be almost Q^2 independent. The experiment from NMC which reduced

the systematic error greatly was therefore surprising . The experimental value definitely departs largely from the $1/3$ and it becomes impossible to explain this large departure perturbatively.

In this situation my formalism sheds new lights [5,6]. In our formalism Gottfried sum rule strongly depends on the pomeron which appears in the singlet moment at $n = 1$. If the pomeron is flavor singlet it should be strictly Q^2 independent . This pomeron reflects the vacuum property of the nucleon[7] which completely lacks in the perturbative approach . Thus our approach and the perturbative one is complementary. The perturbatively predicted Q^2 dependence may be shielded by the large non-perturbative effects or, more practically , it can be regarded as negligible compared with the non-perturbative contribution . The matching of the perturbative Q^2 dependence with the non-perturbative one was done along this line [2]. We considered the followings: In the small x region , non-perturbative physics dominates , and it reflects the vacuum property of the proton . Some of it appears as the heavy intrinsic quarks (intrinsic means that it is not the one produced perturbatively). Because these effects are confined in the small x region we can see their effects in the moments at small n . We consider it the moment at $n = 1$. As we go to the larger x region perturbatively produced pieces become to dominate . Since the contribution from the small x region is suppressed in the moments at large n , we consider them as the perturbatively predicted ones . We took this moments at large n as the ones above $n = 2$. In this way it was shown that the Q^2 dependence in the distribution can be taken into account in our formalism without conflicting the success of the perturbative QCD.

(2) Current anti-commutation relations on the null-plane

Our method is based on the current anti-commutation relations on the null-plane[5,6]. Intuitively they are obtained as follows . We take the scalar current $J_a(x) =: \phi^\dagger(x) \tau_a \phi(x) :$. A canonical commutation relation of the scalar field is

$$[\phi^\dagger(x), \phi(0)]|_{x^+=0} = i\Delta(x), \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta(x)$ at $x^+ = 0$ is $-\epsilon(x^-)\delta(\vec{x}^\perp)/4$.

A connected matrix element of the current product on the null-plane between the one particle state is

$$\begin{aligned} &< p | J_a(x) J_b(0) | p >_c |_{x^+=0} = < p | i\Delta^{(+)}(x) : \phi^\dagger(x) \tau_a \tau_b \phi(0) : \\ &+ i\Delta^{(+)}(x) : \phi^\dagger(0) \tau_b \tau_a \phi(x) : + : \phi^\dagger(x) \tau_a \phi(x) \phi^\dagger(0) \tau_b \phi(0) : | p >_c . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

At $x^+ = 0$, $x^2 = 2x^+x^- - \vec{x}^{\perp 2} = -\vec{x}^{\perp 2} \leq 0$, hence the last term does not contribute to the connected part ,and we get

$$\begin{aligned} &< p | \{ J_a(x), J_b(0) \} | p >_c |_{x^+=0} \\ &= \Delta^{(1)}(x) < p | : \phi^\dagger(x) \tau_a \tau_b \phi(0) : + : \phi^\dagger(0) \tau_b \tau_a \phi(x) : | p >_c . \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &< p | [J_a(x), J_b(0)] | p >_c |_{x^+=0} \\ &= i\Delta(x) < p | : \phi^\dagger(x) \tau_a \tau_b \phi(0) : + : \phi^\dagger(0) \tau_b \tau_a \phi(x) : | p >_c . \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Thus by changing $i\Delta(x) \rightarrow \Delta^{(1)}(x)$ we can get the current anti-commutation relation on the null-plane . Now the last term in the left-hand side of Eq.(5) can not be discarded in the time-like region , hence the assumption to discard it together with the problem of the Schwinger terms are obscure in this method . Thus to justify the intuitive method we need more formal and sound discussions . For this purpose I found the Deser-Gilbert-Sudarshan(DGS) representation [8] which incorporates both the causality and the spectral condition is an appropriate one . In this way I found in the flavor $SU(3) \times SU(3)$ model[5,6]

$$\begin{aligned} & < p | \{ J_a^+(x), J_b^+(0) \} | p >_c |_{x^+=0} \\ & = < p | \{ J_a^{5+}(x), J_b^{5+}(0) \} | p >_c |_{x^+=0} \\ & = \frac{1}{\pi} P\left(\frac{1}{x^-}\right) \delta^2(\vec{x}^\perp) [d_{abc} A_c(p \cdot x, x^2 = 0) + f_{abc} S_c(p \cdot x, x^2 = 0)] p^+. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

If we take the current as $J_a^\mu(x) = \bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(x)$ and $J_a^{5\mu}(x) = \bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(x)$, and if we use the intuitive method , A_c and S_c are related to the bilocal current as

$$S_a^\mu(x|0) = \frac{1}{2} [\bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(0) + \bar{q}(0) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(x)], \quad (9)$$

$$A_a^\mu(x|0) = \frac{1}{2i} [\bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(0) - \bar{q}(0) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q(x)], \quad (10)$$

$$< p | S_a^\mu(x|0) | p >_c = p^\mu S_a(p \cdot x, x^2) + x^\mu \bar{S}_a(p \cdot x, x^2), \quad (11)$$

$$< p | A_a^\mu(x|0) | p >_c = p^\mu A_a(p \cdot x, x^2) + x^\mu \bar{A}_a(p \cdot x, x^2). \quad (12)$$

It should be noted that the causality and the spectral condition are essential to reach Eq.(8). Further , the regular bilocal currents do not exist in QCD because the each coefficient of the expansion of them gets the singular piece due to the anomalous dimension . In other words the bilocal currents presented here are the singular one . Combined with the discussions in (1), we can say that the bilocal currents can be used as the fixed-mass sum rule discussed here corresponding to the moment at $n = 1$ or as the moment sum rules in the perturbative QCD above $n = 2$.

(3) The sum rules for the mean quantum number of the light sea quarks

From Ref.[2] it is straight-forward to get the hypercharge sum rule as[9]

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3} P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_8(\alpha, 0) \\ & = \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x} \{ F_2^{\bar{\nu}p}(x, Q^2) + F_2^{\nu p}(x, Q^2) - 3F_2^{ep}(x, Q^2) - 3F_2^{en}(x, Q^2) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3} P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_8(\alpha, 0) = \frac{1}{3} [2I_\pi - I_K^p - I_K^n], \quad (14)$$

where explicit form of I_π , I_K^p , and I_K^n and their values are given in Ref.[2]. In principle they can be determined experimentally . I found that $I_\pi \sim 5.17$, $I_K^p \sim 2.39$, and $I_K^n \sim 1.61$. Thus we obtain

$$\frac{1}{3}[2I_\pi - I_K^p - I_K^n] \sim 2.12. \quad (15)$$

Subtracting the contribution from the valence quarks from this , we find that the mean hypercharge of the light sea quarks is $(2.12 - 1)/2 \sim 0.56$. Similarly the mean I_3 of the light sea quarks given by the modified Gottfried sum rule is $3(0.26 - 0.33)/4 \sim -0.053$. Thus we get the sum rule of the mean charge of the light sea quarks in the proton and its value as

$$\begin{aligned} < Q >_{light\ sea\ quarks}^{proton} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[\{\frac{1}{2\pi}P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_3(\alpha, 0) - \frac{1}{2}\} + \frac{1}{2}\{\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_8(\alpha, 0) - 1\}] \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(I_\pi + I_K^p - 2I_K^n) - \frac{1}{2} \sim 0.2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Similarly for the neutron

$$\begin{aligned} < Q >_{light\ sea\ quarks}^{neutron} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[-\{\frac{1}{2\pi}P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_3(\alpha, 0) - \frac{1}{2}\} + \frac{1}{2}\{\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} A_8(\alpha, 0) - 1\}] \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(I_\pi - 2I_K^p + I_K^n) \sim 0.3. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

(4) Conclusion

The modified Gottfried sum rule and its relatives give us information of the mean quantum number of the sea quarks in the nucleon . Here we showed that the mean charge of the light sea quarks in the nucleon can be obtained model independently in principle. Though the results has been interpreted in the parton model , they do not depend on this model . They give us the model independent constraint on the integral of the matrix elements of the bilocal currents corresponding to the moment at $n = 1$ in an arbitrary frame of the nucleon .

References

- [1]S.Koretune , Phys.Rev.D47(1993)2690. [2]S.Koretune , Phys.Rev.D52(1995)44.
- [3]S.Koretune , Prog.Theor.Phys.V.69(1983)1746;V.70(1983)1170E.
- [4]D.A.Ross and C.T.Sachrajda , Nucl.Phys.B149(1978)497.
- [5]S.Koretune , Prog.Theor.Phys.V.72(1984)821.
- [6]S.Koretune , Phys.Rev.D21(1980)820. [7]S.Weinberg , *Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Fields Theory* (M.I.T.Press,1970),p.283. [8]S.Deser , W.Gilbert , and E.C.G.Sudarshan , Phys.Rev.115(1959)731. [9]S.Koretune , Fukui Medical School preprint :”Mean charge of the light sea quarks in the proton”.